CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT) WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MIDLAND ODESSA DIVISION UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CAUSE No. MO:09-CR-302 GREGORY NATHANIEL JACKSON MOTION TO RECONSIDER TO THE HONORABIE JUDGE of SAID COURT: Now comes GREGORY NATHANKI JACKSON, DEFENDANT, and files MOTION TO RECONSIDER revocation Sentence and show the following issues: S7B1.2 Reporting Of Violations of Supervised Belease (a) The Probation Officer Shall promptly report to the court any alleged grade A or B violation. Probation Office delay of 7 months to report violation violated due Process.
The Timing of the violation violated Event Protection. Under Statue Class B Violations Must be reported. February 2,2018 A report on Offender was Sent to WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MIDIAND/ODESSA DIVISION and no action taken was signed by Judge Counts. Defendant tifth and tourteenth Amendment was violated based on Several factors. Revocation which possibly Cutn result in confinement for a length of time result in a gricuous loss of liberty. Therefore due process violeted when defendant was unaware of the report being Sent nor made aware that a decision of no action taken had been Signed. .3. Marrant was signed on July 23, 2019 For some offense Judge Counts viewed on February 2, 2018 and no action taken was signed. Defendant believe

	Equal Protection violation occurred along with due
	process violation.
<u>ų.</u>	Defendant was in county Unil on July 23,2018 when
	Federal Warrant was issued. Defendant was unaware
	and was never informed warrant had been issued.
	Defendant due process was violated because had
	he had Knowledge of Federal Warrant he still
	possessed Several Option regarding State Charge.
araban kerre karamatan araban karamatan kerrekanan	Deprived of State Charge Concurrent with Federal
	revocation being one.
5.	October 9, 2019 Almost 2 yrs 12pse Courts revisit
	and Sentence defendant on the Same Charges
	previously resulted IN no action taken Signed by
	Judge Counts. Defendant believe he should be
	protected Under the Same law that resulted IN
	No Action taken on February 2, 2018. Without A
	brief Summary of reason court Signed no
	action taken due pricess violation occured because
	loss of liberty was an option.
(_	Evidence Was Submitted IN Court ON 9.18.18 Probation
	office had received E-mail from defendant Attorney
	regarding pending State Case. Probation Office and Court
	are aware case is still pending. Timing of revocation
mentant coming timent at the set of the set of timent comments	hearing of procedural fairness is not shown when
	defendant has waited Since July 6, 2017 On a
	revocation that is more than likely to take place.
7.	Exidence was Submitted In Court ON January 16,2019
	Defendant notified Probotion Office that he had pled
	guilty to State changes if he could Issue a warrant
	defendant would willingly turn himself in Probation
	office did not notify court of defendant admission
	this violates Equal Protection. Probation Office
	has A Obligation when A Class A or B

	Violation has been made Known. This Action also
	Violated Due Process because defendant had options
	available at that time but has been deprived of
	them at this time. State Charge run concurrent
	with Federal Violation is no longer available and
	violated Duc Process.
8.	Defendant reported to Probation Office on January 22,2019
	as requested by Probation Officer. No Warrant had been
	issued. Defendant had previously Confessed to a Crime
	Probation officer Still failed to Submit A revocation
	request with this new information. Again violating
	Equal Protection and Die Process. This resulted in
	delay of Warrant being issued and registes as time
	run Concurrent in State with Federal Violation
	which or no longer available.
٩.	The foliand assessment delay by filling a raccording
	The federal government delay in filing a revocation warrant deprived the defendant of the opportunity
	to have state Sentence run concurrent with
	federal revocation Sentence. State of Texas
	Court transmit lu Couse No. D-17-1976-CR défendant
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Afterney was asked why Should Courts not impose
	the Tyr Sentence and Accept the 2 yr offer as
	agreed upon before. Attorney States defendant
	was waiting on government to Issue warrant but
	they failed to do So. State Time was going to
	run Concurrent to Federal Sentence. Covernment
	deprived defendant of that option in Duc Process
	Violation.
10.	Defendant Attorney Baymond Five coat States Since he
	has been an attorney Serving in Midland Codessa Court
1 2 2	(desendant believe 15t yes) he has never Seen a Violation
	linger for this time period. Neither government or
	Courts denied this claim. The Western District of
	Texas Midland (odessa Division Summons are given

		and a second sec
	Within 90 days of Class A or B Violations. Wh	٠
	the court shift from everyday procedure to	
	Specific case of exeption Equal Protection of law	
- 1	has been violated. Defendant is not allowed to	
	have his revocation resolved IN A timely manne	
	while other offenders are allowed that opportunity	
	Seriously effect the fairness defendant on by t	he
	Court.	
	·	al dissipative (s) — project space or proper project or an analysis of \$100000000.
11.	The Courts delay la Revocation Violation depriv	دع
	defendant of presenting evidence that was of a	
	importance at that time that resulted IN Due	-
	Process Violations. Defendant was indicted on Str	
	Charges for possession of Exchag or MOMA. How	ever,
	defendant discovery States field test tested po	
1	For meth. This was grounds for dismissal. Bas	
	on State Attorney Tony Chavez who has over	
	25 yes in the federal revocation process In Ode	
	midland Ovision defendant Should weigh options	
	how to proceed once revocation has taken place. I	Defendant
	argument It that time would of been without	<u> </u>
	full Knowledge of What defendant Actualy posses	
	if anything illegal at all what is defendant be	
	Changed for Based ON federal government determine	
	defendant could move forward Accordingly. IF	
	Courts decided to wait on Outcome of State,	
	defendant would challenge the State Charge. H	iad
	government found defendant quilty and revoked	,
	probation State could dismiss Charge, defende	
	Could go to trial, or have State Change run	
	Concurrent with revolution.	
12.	Defendant was detained on line 1,2019 for pending	State
and the second desired second second	charge, Defendant Attorney Submitted to Court For A	
	bond around July 6,2019 no federal warrant had b	
	issued but bond was deried by State Judge - With	
	Knowledge warrant had been issued for defendant	
) · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

-	pled guilty to State Charge of A 2 yr Sentence because
-	he was available for parde in 2 weeks due to the time
	period held lu County Unil. Had the government made defendant
	aware of this warrant he could of filed motion to be
	taken into federal astady. Due Process Violation occured.
	Derindant was deprived of option to have sentence
	van concurrent and not notified of warrant in
	a timely manner.
3.	The timing lapse government delayed IN filing revocation
	deprived defendant to witnesses to speak on his
	behalf. Defendant had worked As A data Specialist
-	tor AFIT A position normally required 5 yr Experience
	defendant held in 9 months. Opportunity for position
	would be available if government modified Sentence
	below guidelines
ч,	Judge Stated defendant letter Stated he don't
	believe incorporation is necessary Since it has
	been 2 yrs Since violation occurred Judge States
	he has to take the violation into account. Defendant
	agrees argues that the Judge is being restricted
	by the Sentencing guideline and doesn't Seem to
	be open to depart below it. Defendant argues Since 19 he has been on federal Supervised release on IN A
	Federal Prison. The longest Period defendant has been
	on Society is the Zyrs After revocation Occuped. He
	had his first child be that time, Started his own
	business along with 3 Contracts from
	All American Cheverolet, Lithia Toyota, and West
	Texas Nissan for the year 2020. If revocation
į	is viewed as A breach of trust defendant has
	displayed Strong efforts to regain trust from
	government. Défendant believes Judge como revocation
	guidelines as mandatory not discretionary. This
	would violate Due Process and Equal Protection Law.
1	

	WHERE FORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, DEFENDO	
	that the court enters and Order 2 below Sentence in this MOTION TO RECONSIDER	
	Bespectfully	Submitted,
	Gregory Na	thaniel Jackson
•		,
		~
*		

Chregory Nathaniel Jackson 27753180 Pholling Plains Regional Jail & Detention Center P.C. Box 847
P.C. Box 847
REC

RECEIVED

OCT 2.1 2019
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

DEPUTY

Chaited States District Court, Howardie Judge
-Mr. David Courts
200 E. Mall

